TRANSMITTAL LETTER (General - Patent Pending)	Docket No. 188515/US

In Re Application Of: **Mortazavi et al.**

Application No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Customer No.	Group Art Unit	Confirmation No.
09/865,978	May 25, 2001	Chankong, Dohm	66083	2152	6345

Title: **METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR ASYNCHRONOUS COMPONENT INVOCATION**

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Transmitted herewith is:

It is noted that the Examiner's Answer, mailed on May 29, 2009, is an exact copy of the Examiner's Answer mailed to the applicant on February 4, 2008. A Reply Brief was previously filed on April 4, 2008. This submission is merely for the purpose of ensuring that the Board considers the Reply Brief when deciding this case.

in the above identified application.

- ☒ No additional fee is required.
- ☐ A check in the amount of is attached.
- ☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. **04-1415** as described below.
  - ☐ Charge the amount of
  - ☒ Credit any overpayment.
  - ☒ Charge any additional fee required.
- ☐ Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

Signature

Dated: Nov. 25, 2009

Gregory P. Durbin, Registration No. 42,503
Dorsey & Whitney LLP
Republic Plaza Building, Suite 4700
370 Seventeenth Street
Denver, CO 80202-5647
Phone: (303) 629-3400
Fax: (303) 629-3450
USPTO Customer No. 66083

cc:

~~I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on~~

~~(Date)~~

~~Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence~~

~~Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence~~

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Applicant:	Mortazavi et al.	
App. No.:	09/865,978	Con. No.: 6345
Filed:	May 25, 2001	Art Unit: 2152
Title:	METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR ASYNCHRONOUS COMPONENT INVOCATION	Examiner: Chankong, Dohm

REPLY BRIEF

MAIL STOP REPLY BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant (hereafter "Appellant") hereby submits this Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer dated February 4, 2008.

Appellant respectfully requests consideration of this appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (hereafter the "Board") based on this Reply Brief and the previously submitted Appeal Brief.

I. THE CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) ARE IMPROPER BECAUSE THE REFERENCE DOES NOT SHOW ALL THE ELEMENTS OF THE CLAIMS

The Examiner's Answer properly sets forth the grounds of rejection in section 9. Specifically, in paragraph 4, the Examiner's answer asserts that U.S. Patent No. 6,804,818 to Codella, et al. (hereinafter "Codella") discloses "the asynchronous request has a void type return and is not associated with application specific exceptions," "storing the request and the scope in a queue on the asynchronous proxy," and "providing a thread for identifying the received request and invoking the second component, wherein the thread identifies an exception listener ... that is stateless." As argued in the previously filed Appeal Brief and further below, the Appellant respectfully disagrees.

A. Codella fails to disclose that the asynchronous request has a void type return and is not associated with application specific exceptions

Appellant argues that none of the text cited by the final Office action and Examiner's Answer supports the conclusion that Codella discloses that the asynchronous request has a void type return as recited by claim 1, and similarly recited by claims 10, 16, 25, 31, 38 and 43. The Examiner argues that Codella's teaching that a message proxy that invokes no return type implies that the request from the message bean also has a void type and does not expect a result from the message proxy. *See Examiner's Answer, page 7.* The Appellant respectfully submits that this does not disclose that the asynchronous request has a void type return for the following reasons.

Codella, when taken as a whole, as required by MPEP § 2141.03VI, discloses that a message bean can perform an asynchronous invocation by invoking a method on a message proxy. *See Codella, column 5, lines 5-6.* The method invoked by the message bean can return a result. Alternatively, the message bean can invoke a method on the message proxy that has been defined to take a callback proxy as a parameter. The callback proxy then receives an asynchronous invocation containing the reply. That is, the message proxy returns either a regular result or a result proxy object from the result proxy, respectively, to the message bean as a result of the invocation. *See Codella, column 9, lines 11-58.* The Appellant respectfully submits that as such, a message proxy with a void type is different from an asynchronous request that has a void type return. No result is returned in response to the asynchronous request with a void type return, contrary to the teachings of Codella.

Accordingly, Appellant respectfully maintains that Codella does not disclose that the asynchronous request has a void type return as required by claims 1, 10, 16, 25, 31, 38 and 43.

B. Codella fails to disclose that the request and the scope are stored in a queue on the asynchronous proxy

Appellant argues that Codella does not disclose "storing the request and the scope in a queue on the asynchronous proxy," as recited by claim 1, and similarly recited by claims 16 and 43. The Examiner asserts that Codella at column 14, lines 2-6 and 13-21 discloses this feature of claim 1. *See Examiner's Answer, page 4, point 4.* However, column 14, lines 2-6 and 13-21 discloses that if the reply includes an exceptional value then the message proxy throws an exception. Because the message proxy blocks until a potentially exceptional result arrives, exception handling for an asynchronous send employs additional support from either the programming model or from the programming language. That is, Codella merely discloses that after the message proxy sends an asynchronous invocation, the reply is handled with additional support from the programming model or language, e.g., using joining threads. Thus, Appellant submits that Codella does not disclose, either explicitly or inherently, storing the request and the scope in a queue on the asynchronous proxy as required by the independent claims 1, 16 and 43.

C. Codella fails to disclose that a thread is provided for identifying the received request and invoking the second component

Appellant submits that Codella does not disclose "providing a thread for identifying the received request and invoking the second component," as recited by claim 1, and similarly recited by claims 16 and 43. The Examiner asserts that Codella at column 14, lines 13-27 and column 16, line 63 through column 17, line 41 discloses this feature of claim 1. *See Examiner's Answer, pages 4-5, point 4.* The recited sections of Codella disclose that exception handling for an asynchronous send employs additional support from the programming model, e.g., using joining threads, and that associating a message bean listener with more than one method would result in the listener receiving concurrent onMessage calls that could not be made thread safe. That is, the recited sections merely disclose that threads may be used and that certain procedures cannot be made thread safe rather than providing a thread for identifying the received request and invoking the second component, as required by the independent claims 1, 16 and 43.

II. CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments submitted in the Appeal Brief and this Reply Brief, the Appellant respectfully submits that all the appealed claims in this application are patentable and requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences direct allowance of the rejected claims.

Appellant believes no further fees or petitions are required. However, if any such petitions or fees are necessary, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 accordingly.

Dated: April 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

John J. Ketchum, Registration No. 61,932
Attorney for Applicant
USPTO Customer No. 66083

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Republic Plaza Building, Suite 4700
370 Seventeenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202-5647
Phone: (303) 629-3400
Fax: (303) 629-3450